

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2020-21 Meeting #13, December 14, 2020

Members (those present in bold, * indicates voting member):

Jim Connors, Chair*

Mark Adams*

Bert Baumgaertner*

Julie Beeston*

Lindsey Brown

Jean-Marc Gauthier*

Kalynn Hanley*

Aleksandra Hollingshead*

Mark Nielsen*

Dean Panttaja

Diane Prorak*

Francesca Sammarruca

Steven Shook*

Sanjay Sisodiya*

Bronte Sone*

Guests Present: Hirotachi Abo, Suzi Ball, Karla Blanco, Brian Dulin, Rebecca Frost, Melissa Goodwin, Abo Hirotachi, Dwaine Hubbard, Jodi Johnson-Maynard, Amy Kingston, Sonya Meyer, Katie Miner, Dave Paul, Sean Quinlan, Ling-Ling Tsao, Mark Warner, Darryl Woolley

I. Chairperson Jim Connors called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. The minutes from December 7, 2020 were approved.

III. Announcements and Communications

- This is a full agenda. We will do our best to get through it, with no guarantees.
- Reminder: This meeting is being recorded.

IV. Old Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-024

Items under consideration: MATH 183 and MATH 583

Speaker: Hirotachi Abo

Discussion: These items were tabled pending discussion between Math and Computer Science. It has been determined that MATH 183 and MATH 483 are different from the similar Computer Science courses and if a student chose to take both sets of courses, they would benefit. There was a friendly amendment to add "or Permission" to the prerequisite list for MATH 483 to make it clear that Computer Science students can take the course even if they do not have the Math prerequisites.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-026

Items under consideration: AGED 263

Speaker: Jim Connors

Discussion: Jim Connors spoke to Ellen Kitchell, interim Chair of History. They have a faculty meeting tomorrow at which they will discuss this course.

Outcome: Remains on table

V. New Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-027

Items under consideration: Admissions Policy

Speaker: Mark Warner, Brian Dulin

Discussion: Context from Mark Warner: The Vandal Gateway program came out in January of last year and ended up in CLASS after a rough start. They have hired a program coordinator, Suzi Ball. The President's emergency order has expired, so in consultation with Barb Kirchmeier of Faculty Senate they decided to go through the process to formalize the program. That led to this Admissions Policy, which needed clarification. After going through several iterations, the Admissions Committee came to this proposed version. There are already organizations that serve under-prepared students with some success; now the Vandal Gateway program is added to that list. Rather than change policy specifically for Vandal Gateway, they want to clarify the process in a way that benefits all. Requiring three letters of recommendation could be a barrier for many students, especially first-generation students. This change will empower the organizations that focus on first-generation students and other underserved groups. Then the Admissions Committee can consider those applicants and refer them to the program that would help them be the most successful. Mark Nielsen asked what the vote on the Admissions Committee was for this proposal. When they first considered this in February, there were some reservations. However, when they voted on it this Summer, it passed unanimously. Mark questioned this, saying that a member of the committee approached him asking what they could do to stop this. Francesca Sammarruca asked some clarifying questions about the purpose of this proposal. She also asked if the committee determined the letters of recommendation were not particularly helpful. Brian Dulin admitted that sometimes the letters are helpful, other times they are rather generic and add very little value. In the end, the Admissions Committee determined they were not essential. There are typically 500 students denied admission to the university each year, and typically 100 or less of those students petition the Admissions Committee. They wonder if making it easier to petition the decision plus having the additional support provided by the Vandal Gateway program might lead that number to rise. Francesca asked if they committee considered language like, "The committee may request three letters of recommendation," so they would have the discretion to require them when needed. Brian replied that it could complicate the process. Rather, they are hoping to simplify the process. If that works, great. If not, they can change it again. Bert Baumgaertner asked if they considered other third-party verification processes, such as a reference. Brian replied they did not consider that. However, references are something that could easily be added even with this proposed language. Bert asked what it would look like if they tried to find a compromise. He believes the concern of some UCC members is having a way of checking with a third-party rather than relying on the student's own letter. Dr. Karla Blanco, an Admissions Committee member, asked what benefit comes from having third-party input. What problem would that solve? Bert explained that since the student did not meet the regular standards of admission, there is additional work that needs to be done to demonstrate that they are prepared to handle the demands of attending college. The written statement goes towards that, but some feel it is insufficient. He proposes a reference we can check as a simpler process. The committee could call that reference person if they had questions. Mark Nielsen stated his concern as follows: any exceptions to our Admissions requirement generally constitute a weakening of those standards. He thinks it is important to have third-party verification that a student is a good candidate. He also rejects the argument that letters of recommendation are a burden. If a student cannot provide those letters,

how will they succeed in college. Karla replied that she works primarily with Latino students who often work many hours to help their families, and often under employers who might not be willing to provide a reference. They also do not know how to navigate the educational system, in general. Once they are here, there are resources to support them. However, barriers to admission prevent them from accessing those resources. Steven pointed out that this change came up last Spring at our April meeting and was voted down. Brian disagreed, saying this proposal was only passed by the Admissions Committee over the summer. Steve said he is uncomfortable that this change seems to be driven by the Vandal Gateway program, when many other students go through the Admissions petition process who are not part of that program. Steve has been on the Admissions Committee in the past and there were students who wrote terrible letters but were admitted because the letters of recommendation made their case when the students were unable to adequately express themselves. He is concerned this will have the opposite effect they intend, blocking out students who could have made it in with letters of recommendation. Sanjay Sisodiya believes the letters of recommendation provide value. They provide additional insight at times when students struggle to communicate. He gave an example from his own personal life. Kalynn Hanley clarified that students could still provide letters of recommendation; it just would not be required. Brian believes there are times in which the letters are impactful, but most of the time they add very little value. Last year, 79 students appealed through the Admissions Committee. They are curious to see how many more applicants they can get if they simplify the process, and curious to evaluate the success of those students at the end of the year. They would like to give this process a chance. Mark Warner agrees with Karla that extra requirements often become a barrier. Lindsey Brown asked if a student who went through the process without letters could try again with additional letters of recommendation or would be completely done with the process for the year. Brian replied that the committee would have the option of requesting additional letters in borderline cases.

Outcome: 5 yes, 5 no – motion is denied

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: Agricultural and Extension Education name change

Speaker: Jim Connors

Discussion: Jim Connors explained the rationale for the change. The proposed name better reflects what they teach. At the time the department was originally formed, most departments at colleges around the country were called Agriculture and Extension Education. However, the extension piece has declined dramatically. Now, departments tend to include some aspect of Leadership or Communications in their department name. Sanjay Sisodiya commends Jim for being very clear in the second paragraph of the rationale that they are only dealing with Agricultural Leadership, rather than leadership in general.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: B.S.A.V.S. in Animal and Veterinary Science

Speaker: Stacey Doumit

Discussion: They are streamlining the degree and giving students more flexibility within each of the three options. Lindsey Brown said the way CHEM 101/111 and CHEM 101L/111L are listed, it looks like students could take the lecture from one and the lab from the other. Rebecca Frost adjusted the way that section was written to clarify. Amy Kingston pointed out that the labs and lectures are corequisites.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: FCS 254 and FCS 334

Speaker: Erin Chapman

Discussion: They are breaking FCS 334 into two smaller courses – one that will cover middle childhood and one that will focus primarily on adolescent and young adult development.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: FCS 329

Speaker: Sonya Meyer

Discussion: They are removing Junior standing to allow students to take the course during their sophomore year. The content will help them improve their final design work in their senior capstone.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: FCS 424

Speaker: Sonya Meyer

Discussion: This is a prerequisite change to add Senior standing. In the past, students took this during their Junior year. They are more successful when they have more experience before taking this course, which is designed to be a Senior Experience. They are also dropping FCS 219 as a prerequisite since it is implied in the other prerequisites. Lindsey Brown asked about the requirement for a public exhibition since there are students with privacy concerns. Sonya Meyer replied that those would fall under extenuating circumstances. However, if they are going into the Apparels, Textile and Design industry, they must be prepared to present their work to the public. In the past, they have done fashion shows and now they do a gallery-style presentation. If there are extenuating circumstances, the department would make allowances for that. Jim Connors clarified that the public exhibition is of the product, not the person. Sonya agreed, and said their presentation boards talk about their inspiration, fabrics, etc. but do not necessarily include identifying information about the student. Sanjay Sisodiya pointed out that some students are considered seniors academically even if they are still juniors as far as their sequence within the major. He suggests having a late-junior or early-senior class as a prerequisite.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: FCS 436

Speaker: Erin Chapman

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: FCS 463

Speaker: Katie Miner

Discussion: They are removing a prerequisite due to changes in the curriculum and adjusting the course description to allow for changes in the profession. This will prevent them from having to update the description as new methodologies emerge.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: FCS 492

Speaker: Katie Miner

Discussion: The current title can confuse students since it is similar to another course, “Nutrition in the Life Cycle.” They are updating the description to distinguish it from other courses and updating the prerequisites to remove courses that are no longer necessary.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: Human and Community Engagement Minor

Speaker: Erin Chapman and Sarah Bush

Discussion: This minor brings together the human component of human stages of life and how we engage with communities and do community work. The final piece is a service-learning engagement within the community. The goal is to help students engage successfully with their communities, whether that is for their career or for social outreach and volunteer work.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: ASM 405

Speaker: Jodi Johnson-Maynard

Discussion: This is a new course that will partner with an existing course, ASM 305. Between the two, they will cover all aspects of Precision Agriculture. These will be part of the Precision Agriculture Certificate that is further down the agenda.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: ASM 476

Speaker: Jodi Johnson-Maynard

Discussion: This was already passed as REM 475 – now they are adding on ASM 476 as a cross-list.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: SOIL 434/534

Speaker: Jodi Johnson-Maynard

Discussion: A new faculty member starting teaching this when he joined several years ago. It has been taught as a 404/504 twice. This class gives a broader treatment than their soil fertility course.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: SOIL 452/552

Speaker: Jodi Johnson-Maynard

Discussion: This used to be taught by a faculty member who left to go to WSU. It was taught with an Engineering prefix. Thus, there was a revision of the subject code and content. The revision makes it appropriate for students outside of Engineering. Lindsey Brown recommended adding back the statement re: additional work for graduate credit. This was approved – Jodi Johnson-Maynard was unsure why it was struck. Typically, graduate students in the department do an additional report or proposal. The word “effects” was also changed to “impacts.”

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: ASM 412 and ASM 433

Speaker: Jodi Johnson-Maynard

Discussion: These courses are being dropped because faculty have retired and have not been replaced. They are reluctant to let these go, but they do not have faculty with the time or expertise to teach these.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: Precision Agriculture Academic Certificate

Speaker: Jodi Johnson-Maynard

Discussion: They are excited about this new certificate. It allows them to target the growing area of precision agriculture. There are universities across the US at the same stage, trying to adequately prepare students to go to work in the agriculture industry. That industry is clamoring for students with these skills. Lindsey Brown asked a clarifying question about the required number of credits. The internship is 1-3 credits, which explains the variance. They want to give students flexibility. Those in the workforce who want to finish more quickly can just take one credit, but those who want to do more in-depth research could do up to 3 credits of internship. Jodi Johnson-Maynard pointed out a missing -or-course – ASM 405 should be an alternate course to ASM 409. The minimum number of required credits is 13.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: Sustainable Food Systems Minor

Speaker: Jodi Johnson-Maynard

Discussion: This was brought on as a major several years ago, but they have received feedback that there are students who would like more of a systems-based understanding of food but do not want a full major. They created this minor to fill that gap. The courses all have a sustainability perspective as well as a focus on communication skills.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: BUS 429

Speaker: Darryl Woolley

Discussion: This adjusts the number of repeat credit hours allowed for this experiential learning course and adds language about the field trips. Sanjay went on record to say this is not a Marketing course.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: ECON 272

Speaker: Darryl Woolley

Discussion: The old description discouraged some students from taking this course, so they are adjusting the description. Lindsey Brown asked about whether we can enforce the fact that this is equivalent to both ECON 201 and 202. Rebecca Frost replied that functionally, we already do this. Rebecca asked whether they intended to remove the phrase about carrying no credit after ECON 201 and 202. That needs clarification.

Outcome: Tabled pending clarification

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: FIN 260, FIN 460, FIN 467, FIN 468

Speaker: Darryl Woolley

Discussion: They are adding language about required field trips. They also clarify that FIN 260 and 460 can meet concurrently, which is already the practice with these courses.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: OM 456/556

Speaker: Darryl Woolley

Discussion: Darryl Woolley explained the changes. A statement was added that additional work is required for graduate credit.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-028

Items under consideration: OM 472

Speaker: Darryl Woolley

Discussion: This is a change in name and an updated course description. Lindsey Brown suggested a tweak to the short title abbreviation, which was approved.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

VI. Additional Questions or Discussion – none

- There was a question about abstentions. Jim Connors clarified that abstentions are not calculated into a vote count. The only votes that determine whether a proposal passes or fails are the yes or no votes. In the case of a tie, the proposal does not pass.

VII. Chairperson Jim Connors closed the meeting at 5:01 pm. UCC will reconvene on Monday, January 11, 2020.

Amy Kingston
UCC Secretary